20¢ DECEMBER 5, 1949

New Republic

A THIRD OF A NATION
AND WHAT TO DO ABOUT IT

AN EDITORIAL

NEW BROOM SWEEPS PHILADELPHIA

By JOHANNES U. HOEBER

KANGAROO COURT ON YAMASHITA

Review by DON HOLLENBECK

JULIAN HUXLEY ON THE LYSENKO DISPUTE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CHRISTMAS BARGAINS – 1949

▶ For the first time in six years we are able to offer our readers a choice of book and magazine selections for Christmas gifts at reduced prices.

▶ First, gifts of the *New Republic* to friends: in these confused and dangerous times, it is a bold and confident voice. Your friends will be reminded of your thoughtfulness every week during the coming year, and the *New Republic* will be indebted to you for your aid in helping maintain a strong liberal publication.

▶ As in former years, we may again offer tempting bargains of books and other magazines jointly with a subscription to the *New Republic*. A Christmas card, if requested, will be sent in your name to the recipients of gift subscriptions. Books and magazines may be sent to separate addresses as provided for in the order form below. *Your own subscription may be included* in these money-saving offers. To avoid last-minute Christmas delays in the mails, please act NOW.

Bargains in subscriptions to the New Republic–$11 or $16

▶ Two one-year subscriptions, or one two-year subscription for $11; three one-year subscriptions for $16. Your own subscription may be included no matter when it expires. A Christmas card, in your name, will be sent to each recipient of a subscription.

Bargains in combination with other magazines–$8.50 to $12.50

▶ One year of the *New Republic, Harper's* and *Atlantic Monthly* (reg. $17.50)–all three for $12.50 (a saving of $5). Or *Harper's* with the *New Republic* for $8.50 (you save $3), or *Atlantic* with the *New Republic* (saving $3).

Bargains with Modern Library Books

▶ The *New Republic* for one year and any ONE of these Modern Library books (Random House, regularly $1.25) for $6.75. Postage is prepaid. The book and the magazines may be mailed to one or to separate addresses.

Twentieth Century American Poetry, selected by Conrad Aiken
The Short Bible, edited by Goodspeed and Smith
Wuthering Heights, by Emily Brontë
Walden and Other Writings, by Henry David Thoreau
Lord Jim, by Joseph Conrad
Eminent Victorians, by Lytton Strachey
Crime and Punishment, by Fyodor Dostoyevsky
Human Nature and Conduct, by John Dewey
Moby Dick, by Herman Melville
A Bell for Adano, by John Hersey
The Philosophy of Plato, edited by Irwin Edman
Of Human Bondage, by W. Somerset Maugham
Vanity Fair, by William M. Thackeray
Life with Father, by Clarence Day
Green Mansions, by W. H. Hudson

After making your selections, please clip, fill out and mail the order form below.

The New Republic • 40 East 49 Street • New York 17

For the enclosed _____ please send the *New Republic* to

Name_____

Street_____

City_____

State_____

and send to

_____

_____

_____

_____

and send to

_____

_____

_____

_____

12/5/49

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Republic

CONTENTS FOR DECEMBER 5, 1949

5 The Submerged Ten Million: An Editorial
6 The Week:
6 Two Gone
7 Food Clearing House
7 Beside the Canal
7 The Electrical Workers
8 Herblock Cartoon
8 The UN as King Solomon
8 Ideas About the Atom
9 Outside America
11 Why Lysenko Is Important by Julian Huxley
14 New Broom in Philadelphia by Johannes U. Hoeber
17 Harold L. Ickes
18 Books:
18 Kangaroo Court on Yamashita by Don Hollenbeck
19 Satirist's Utopia by Alexander Klein
20 Brief Comment
21 Theatre
22 Radio and Television

EDITOR: Michael Straight

EDITORIAL DIRECTOR: Bruce Bliven

PUBLISHER: Daniel Mebane

MANAGING EDITOR: Jack Weeks

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Malcolm Cowley, John Farrelly, Harold L. Ickes, Joseph P. Lash, Max Lerner, James R. Newman, Gus Tyler

FOREIGN AFFAIRS EDITOR: Percy Winner

WASHINGTON BUREAU: Helen Fuller (Political Editor), Jean Begeman

DEPARTMENTS: Robert Hatch (Chief), Cecil Smith (Music), Saul Carson (Radio and Televison), Harold Clurman (Theatre), Lincoln Kirstein (Fine Arts)

COPY EDITING: Elizabeth Huling (Chief), Ruth Tarcov

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1949, IN THE U. S. A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49 ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y. ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879. SINGLE COPY 20¢; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, $6.50; CANADA AND FOREIGN, $7.50. PRINTED IN THE U. S. A.

WASHINGTON WIRE

PRESIDENT TRUMAN is taking three weeks' change in Florida. What the President needs most, we suggest, is a chance to think. Maybe he'll get that at Key West. Casting up accounts, Truman sees at home a favorable political situation. The public will vote for New Deal liberalism. A lot of Democrats, however, who secretly hate the slogan are using it. Sooner or later Truman will have to come to grips with them. Maybe that can wait; for the moment things look good for the "ins," bad for the "outs."

Clark Clifford's retirement as special counsel for Truman weakens Our Side in the White House; contrariwise, it strengthens the Sawyer-Steelman-Snyder faction which is always telling Truman to go slow on social reforms and not to alienate Respectable People. Clifford knew the score. In many ways, he was the strongest liberal influence in the Presidential entourage. He and Oscar Chapman (slated to become Secretary of Interior shortly) helped toward fixing the seemingly hopeless Truman '48 campaign on the polestar of New Dealism.

What can we say adequately about Lilienthal's departure? He leaves the toughest $17,500 job in America. It carries every Congressman's doubt, every hysterical editor's suspicion, and the holder of the job is gagged from making factual reply. Lilienthal carried this load with cheerful serenity and won every battle (as he did in the TVA days). The phrase "to hickenlooper" is only one relic of the final rout of his critics which is likely to linger long in political parlance. When Taft is represented as a "liberal," let it be remembered that he leagued with aged McKellar in the 1947 anti-Lilienthal confirmation fight.

We shall never forget those hushed few minutes in the public hearing when Lilienthal, goaded beyond endurance by the venomous McKellar, uttered his own private "I believe." Lilienthal built his faith, he said, on the "personal dignity of the individual." For a heartbeat or two, the quiet fervor of his comment turned the gaudy show into something very much like a religious service. We can still see the rapt look dying slowly out of the faces of the clerks, stenographers and reporters as Lilienthal quietly finished and they turned from him to the face of old Kenneth McKellar, the Senator from Tennessee who was conducting the smear campaign.

After 25 years of publicity Dr. Morris Fishbein is being ejected, not too gently, as the mouthpiece of the American Medical Association. As Milton Mayer puts it in this month's *Harper's*, the AMA is withdrawing from him its Seal of Acceptance. In 1932 Fishbein called even voluntary medical-insurance plans "socialism and communism, inciting to revolution." Times changed and ultimately the voluntary plans became for Fishbein "the American way."

Clem Whitaker, $100,000-a-year press agent, is taking over his job in organized medicine's fight against health insurance. This looks as though it will be the biggest political advertising spree in 1950. Plans include a multi-million-dollar year-long campaign in 12,000 daily and weekly papers, with billboards, radios and magazines to boot, to be tied in with any other institutional advertising that scourges "socialism."

James F. Byrnes's anti-Fair Deal speech at Biloxi, Mississippi, last week was simple in motive: to make the Dixiecrats respectable. Their original walkout was based on Jim Crow racialism, and the splinter group was obvi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ously financed by unsavory pressure boys and rich lobbyists interested in tideland oil and similar matters. Obviously the Dixiecrats had to find a mantle of respectability to conceal this, and they got the eminent and agreeable Byrnes. His lofty address might have been written by Hoover; it never mentioned civil rights at all. Northern GOP papers hailed the address with wild hope. It is still their dream to unite American conservatives politically. What a ticket Eisenhower-Byrnes would be. Byrnes will be 72 in 1952, but that's nothing; Alben's honeymooning at the same age!

Notes. Lilienthal's retirement gives a chance to restore bipartisanship to the atomic-energy program; the AEC chairman knew the GOP had made him a hate symbol and it influenced his decision to quit for patriotic reasons. . . . Scripps-Howard newspapers seemed disappointed that the Administration got consul Angus Ward out of China without war. . . . It isn't popular to say it yet, but US recognition of the new Chinese government may follow Britain's before long, at least if the Chinese Reds learn any manners. . . . A recent AEC report indicates that an A-bomb in the center of Washington would wipe out about everything; citizens cheerfully explain they live in the second- or third-degree-burn area.

Our theory is that socialism spreads in America by default not assault: our eyes are fixed on the railroads, which got a 10-percent fare hike in 1947, another of 17 percent last year, and now 12.5 percent more by a 6-to-4 vote of the friendly ICC, pricing themselves right out of the market. This is the straight path toward government ownership. . . . Taft in his Ohio fight is being played up as "underdog" against union tyranny; actually he's getting so much GOP dough that some of it may be diverted to jittery Senator Wiley, the Taft-man seeking reëlection in Wisconsin. . . . "Statism" didn't catch on in the Dulles campaign; the GOP high command is going back to good old "socialism," à la Byrnes at Biloxi.

Washington T. R. B.

CORRESPONDENCE

Debate on the Atom

SIR: Your editorial on atomic controls (the *New Republic*, November 7) was obviously written by someone who has studied the atomic situation earnestly and with greater effect than most people.

Several of your specific proposals I think have merit—probably because I've veered toward the same ideas and tried them out on various delegations before this. On the other hand, I don't see much likelihood of the delegates stirring out of their present rut.

I don't think your Points 1 and 2 [cessation of atomic production for military use and the placement of existing bombs in UN escrow] are politically practicable or even desirable at present. Immediate cessation of atomic-weapons manufacture would reduce the military strength of the United States, or rather, put a ceiling on it which would be immediately reported to Russia through the inspection process. Meantime, there would be no comparable reduction in Russian military strength, which at present at least rests on primarily non-atomic factors. Until you link up atomic control with other disarmament and security measures, simply stopping the manufacture of weapons would be unilateral Western Power disarmament.

But your Points 3 and 4 [maintenance of small national plants for production of non-military energy and an inspection system centered upon mining operations and correlated with a world uranium survey] are actually the early years of the majority plan, if it were ever worked out in the detail it should have. The majority plan provides for minimum production for actual beneficial uses. Such uses at present are only the radioactive materials used for medicine and research. They could be produced in needed quantities by small reactors, which the majority plan says would be safe for national operation, if coupled with the thoroughgoing inspection of uranium and thorium resources. There's no reason why the majority shouldn't go into detail on this.

In fact, it would mean shutting down Oak Ridge and Hanford in all the early years. I think the implications are worth working out. I suspect the Russians would still reject the result—among other things, because it would mean a considerable survey of their country and a considerable outgoing of their own experts, in UN service. But in a package, the inspection made possible by this plan might compensate for the reduction of atomic-weapons strength that shutting Oak Ridge and Hanford would mean, and at such a time it might well be worth shutting them down.

I think the editorial is unfair to the American plan by terming it essentially negative. In fact, it started with a grand aim of coöperation for peaceful development. We have lost sight of that aim in the bitterness of the debates. But it was a good aim, and it still is. One of the best things the UN could still do is to promote the safe use of radioactive materials for scientific research and development right now. . . .

I'm glad you're plugging away at this problem. At Lake Success, the atomic negotiations tend to get immersed in pessimism and inertia, and it will probably be from outside that any good ideas ever do come, anyway.

PETER KIHSS

United Nations Bureau,
New York Herald Tribune,
Lake Success, N. Y.

The Dewey School

SIR: In your Special Issue of October 17, in recognition of the ninetieth birthday of John Dewey, you kindly published a message from me in which I recorded myself as "one of his most ardent followers."

Letters from puzzled friends who know how radically I have differed with Mr. Dewey seem to require that I give them an explanation.

The message which I sent to the *New Republic* contained two paragraphs, the first of which stressed, mainly, my disagreements with Mr. Dewey, and the second, my agreements. Because your issue was over-crowded and because my statement ran over the 250-word limit suggested to me by the editors, they omitted my first paragraph.

May I, then, correct the record as you have given it? The greatness of Mr. Dewey's leadership is recognized both by those who agree with him and by those who differ. In that sense, we are all his "followers." But when saying that, I must also say that, for my own part, I cannot accept many of his conclusions, especially as they are interpreted by his disciples. In general his school seems to me to have followed the drift of our popular opinion rather than to have given it the criticism which it sorely needs.

May I take this opportunity to make one other correction? Though living in Berkeley, I am not on the staff of the University of California.

ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN

Berkeley, Calif.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOLUME 121, NUMBER 23, ISSUE 1827, NEW YORK CITY, DECEMBER 5, 1949 **New Republic**

THE SUBMERGED TEN MILLION

AT KEY WEST, President Truman and his intimate advisers have begun work on the State of the Union Message which the President will deliver to Congress, January 5. The major problem they must decide is: Where best to expand the American economy? The President has shown his progressive spirit in economic matters by placing his personal stamp on the idea that this country can advance from its present $250 billion economy to at least a $400 billion level within the next few years. To do so, we must expand the total economy by roughly three percent every year during that period, according to estimates of Leon Keyserling, acting chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

In a special report on our low-income families, Senator John Sparkman (D, Ala.) and a group from the Congressional Joint Committee on the Economic Report have produced perhaps the most constructive answer yet offered to the problem facing the President. Ten million American families are still earning less than $2,000 a year, the Sparkman committee reports. "The unfilled wants" of these 32 million individuals "constitute a great underdeveloped economic frontier —a vast and expansible market for the products of American industry. The low-income families have been left behind in the economic progress of America."

Our wartime boom and postwar prosperity have done very little toward breaking down the barriers between the poorest one-third of our nation and the rest of the American people. Though these families can no longer be uniformly described as "ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished," as Franklin Roosevelt described them fifteen years ago, they remain a class apart, unlikely to contribute much, if anything, to the greater productivity of the nation.

The Sparkman report provides a good directory indicating who these lowest-income people are. About two-thirds of the ten million are urban or small-town families; one-third live on farms. Four of the ten million in the under-$2,000 class make less than $1,000 a year. More than one-fourth of the city families with incomes below $2,000 seem to be in the substandard class because of "impoverished old age."

About 1.5 million of the low-income city households are "broken families," headed by women. Another 1.5 million are disabled persons. One-eighth, about 800,000, of the non-farm families are Negroes, who are of course a considerably greater proportion of the low-income group than they are of the general population. The nucleus of the urban low-income group is the unskilled. Sixty-four percent of the heads of low-income city families have not gone beyond an eighth-grade education. Only six percent have gone beyond high school.

Approximately one-fifth of the nation's children are to be found in this lowest third of our families; and the chance that these millions of children will advance beyond the occupational status of their fathers is much slighter than is generally assumed. The sociologists who have studied occupational trends most closely tell us that we have reached an "essentially stratified condition" with regard to unskilled workers in the United States.

The unskilled level, two of the leading authorities on occupational mobility say, "is not a catchall for those who fail to make good in the more exacting and better-paid occupations. On the contrary, male workers who are so unfortunate as to perform unskilled labor as their means of livelihood exhibit more of the characteristics of caste than any other occupational group."

Probably one-half of our manual laborers could be moved up into skilled occupations without causing any serious lack of unskilled labor. What happens to this group at the first sign of depression, and the low wages paid them at all times, are evidence that technology has already made our present large proportion of unskilled workers unnecessary. There are vast numbers in the lower group who have the ability to advance, on a basis of IQ as well as inclination. The Sparkman report cites Harvard studies estimating that "from three to five percent of our young people, or annually some 75,000 to 125,000, are of college caliber and would go to college but are prevented by poverty."

But it is also true that the occupational pattern is so firmly set that heavy blasting will be required to change it. Two major approaches are called for: regional development in the underdeveloped areas of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

country, and a revamped and greatly expanded system of vocational training. Regional development can provide new industrial job opportunities. Some of the economic statistics on the Tennessee Valley, included in the Sparkman report, illustrate how much the TVA approach can mean to the people concerned. Whereas in 1933, the average per-capita income in 122 Tennessee Valley counties was $148 as compared to the average of $368 for the United States as a whole, by 1947 those same valley counties had increased their per-capita income during the intervening years of the TVA by 212.7 percent, as compared to an average national increase of 108.6 percent.

Vast new programs of on-the-job training and vocational guidance will stimulate extension of the division-of-labor techniques that have done so much to make this nation a leader in industry, and can make it possible to use skills to better advantage than ever before.

A new approach to vocational training will also be required. The traditional vocational school is certainly not the instrument by which to inject a large amount of new skill into the industrial system in short order. The sort of program needed is far more like that of the National Youth Administration of the New Deal than that of the average vocational high school, which thinks in terms the opposite of full employment.

A 1950 version of both the NYA and the Civilian Conservation Corps of depression years could certainly be reëstablished with profit. Some part of the one million young people between 17 and 23 who are now out of school and out of work might well be employed on federal conservation jobs, supplemented by practical vocational training. The first step in obtaining a better occupational distribution is to encourage the flow of new labor into more economically important occupations. Millions can well be invested in training that will divert the children of our unskilled workers into other lines.

The Sparkman report is aimed directly at the most crucial question of our economy today: how to redistribute the national income to stimulate greater national purchasing power. Obviously that part of the low-income problem caused by farm poverty calls for an entirely different set of remedial measures from that demanded by the problem of the lowest-income families in our cities. To raise the living standard for our old people and for the Negroes, for disabled persons and broken families, requires different kinds of action. Programs for dealing with these special groups must be pushed speedily and simultaneously. But by far the most rewarding prospect of increasing our economic potential in the near future is the turning of vast numbers of workers from low-paid manual tasks to well-paid skilled occupations.

The Sparkman committee's report is an admirable reopening of a problem too long neglected. But it is only a reopening. To deal effectively with the situation this report describes, we must, first of all, have a full analysis of present conditions. This would mean developing statistics on income and expenditures that do not now exist, carrying out sociological studies on what living is like in low-income families, examining the human values involved. Senator Sparkman is to be congratulated for having had the courage to spotlight some of the most unpleasant facts of our national life.

THE WEEK

TWO GONE

The federal government lost two important public servants last week. David Lilienthal resigned as chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and Clark Clifford left his post as special counsel to President Truman. Their reasons for doing so boxed the compass of the problem of keeping good men in government service.

Clifford left mainly because he feels he needs more money than his salary of $20,000 a year (it was $12,000 until it was increased by an Act of Congress a few months ago). To millions of Americans with incomes a tenth as large (see page 5), this will seem like a sour joke; but for Clifford and for hundreds of other government officials who have taken the same action, the dilemma is a real one. President Truman now loses an important member of his circle and an unfaltering supporter of the Fair Deal—one of the very few in the White House circle.

In Lilienthal's case the problem is more complicated. He was getting $2,500 less than Clifford, and had spent 20 years in government service at a quarter or a fifth as much as he could doubtless earn in private business; but probably more important in his eyes are two other matters. The atom-bomb race is now a question of profound importance; Lilienthal wants to help make American policy on that subject without wearing the muzzle of the AEC chairman. The second reason is uglier. For many years Lilienthal has been persecuted by the unbelievable Senator McKellar, the incredible Senator Hickenlooper and the extraordinary Senator (Edwin) Johnson. None

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the accusations made against him by these and others has stood up—except the unspoken one that he has Jewish blood. It is hardly surprising that he should decide that 20 years of this is enough. As he goes, both he and his fellow citizens can remember not only his good job as chairman of the AEC but that he played the major role in carrying out the one American enterprise of the past few decades admired and imitated all over the world—the Tennessee Valley Authority.

FOOD CLEARING HOUSE

A new plan for world food distribution, by means of an International Commodity Clearing House (ICCH), was proposed at the Food and Agriculture Organization's fifth annual conference in Washington. Delegates from 58 countries are giving serious consideration to the idea, worked out by a group of experts headed by Norris E. Dodd, former Undersecretary of the US Department of Agriculture who is now director-general of the FAO.

As applied to the US, the clearing house would mean acceptance of foreign currencies instead of dollars as payment for farm surpluses shipped abroad in excess of "normal" farm exports. The world commodity clearing house would carry out two types of transactions. It would purchase surpluses for resale at reduced prices in hard, or relatively hard, currencies. It would arrange for the sale of surplus commodities at the full commercial price in the currency of the buying country. Such *soft* currencies would be credited in the books of ICCH to the supply country and, perhaps, would be held until that currency itself becomes convertible. The objective is to forge a link between areas of surplus and of hunger in time to head off restrictive national programs that might lead to world depression.

Dodd, in his opening address, pointed out that 1949 has been in general what farmers call a good year. Food shortages are no longer perilous for nearly the whole world, as they were through 1947. "For more than half the world, however," he said, "the old chronic undernourishment continues and hunger is scarcely one meal away from millions. For the world as a whole, per-person food supplies are not as good as before the war."

America's reluctance to campaign actively for ICCH has puzzled many, since farmers in this country would reap the greatest benefits from the plan. The United States has from 90 to 98 percent of the world's disposable farm surpluses. Actually, the Administration fears that Congress would refuse to appropriate the $450 million that represents the US share in setting up an ICCH. This attitude is viewed as pessimistic by farm experts, who point out that farm-bloc legislators are anxious to rid the US market of the price-depressive threat of the stored surpluses. At a recent Cabinet meeting, however, Administration leaders decided to keep one foot in the door and work toward a compromise so as not to be held responsible for killing ICCH.

The State Department is working on an alternative plan for shipping wheat, rice and cotton surpluses to the Far East, swapping them for strategic or needed materials whenever possible and giving away the rest if necessary. The Treasury Department is cool to ICCH on the ground that it is already overburdened with "soft currencies" acquired during and after the war. Secretary of Agriculture Brannan has remained openminded, partly because of the influence of Stanley Andrews, chief of the Department's agricultural foreign-relations office, who is strongly in favor of the plan.

BESIDE THE CANAL

Panama is a sensitive area to the United States, since the Canal is so vital to our national security. By the end of last week, after having had three Presidents in about as many days, the Republic of Panama was doing business as usual—with matters only slightly worse, from the American point of view, than they were before.

Colonel José Remon, Panama's strong man, was still in control of the country. His new puppet is Arnulfo Arias, who was strongly pro-Axis during the war, and until recently opposed Colonel Remon. Presidents No. One and No. Two, Daniel Chanis and Roberto Chiari, had both fallen because they incurred Remon's displeasure. Remon is a stockholder in two monopolistic enterprises, a slaughterhouse and a bus line. The Panama Supreme Court had ordered these monopolies broken up; Remon refused to permit it. Chanis demanded compliance with the Court and lost his job. So did Chiari, who succeeded him.

But Arias may find his troubles are only beginning. The United States has a longtime policy of not recognizing Latin American governments that come into existence by violence, and most of the Latin republics follow our lead. Remon and Arias may find it hard to stand up to the sort of pressure that will be imposed.

THE ELECTRICAL WORKERS

As the new, anti-Communist electrical workers' union opened its organizing convention in Philadelphia this week, James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO, announced that almost half of the 400,000 former UE members have joined the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, CIO. Their prospect looked good. But the job of holding NLRB elections in each plant is still ahead.

Westinghouse Electric has filed with the National Labor Relations Board 75 separate petitions for elections covering 64 of its operating units. The IUE-CIO had hoped for an industry-wide election covering all 65,000 Westinghouse employees, but the separate petitions put bargaining on a small-unit basis. The first company to seek NLRB elections was Allis-Chalmers, with petitions covering two units in Norwood, Ohio, and Boston. IUE attorneys have filed petitions for representation elections to be held in plants of 10 companies now under contract with the UE.

The NLRB, consequently, faces a di-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lemma since it has ruled that elections will not be held where a collective-bargaining contract is in force. Many of the present UE contracts will not expire until next summer. Final determination of when and how the elections will be held rests with the NLRB.

The report with which Carey, chairman of the organizing committee for the new union, opened its first convention is a preview of the line that the IUE will use to persuade old UE members to bolt to it. The IUE will undertake to prove that the "political" rather than the "bargaining" methods of the old union have deprived electrical workers of benefits generally enjoyed in other industries. The electrical industry is highly prosperous today, the IUE will argue, but it pays wages below those which steel and auto workers receive and has not granted the security plans available to workers in those industries.

THE UN AS KING SOLOMON

For years, the great powers have been struggling with the problem of the former Italian colonies in Africa. After a long deadlock, they gave up and bucked the job to the UN General Assembly, agreeing in advance to accept its decision. The General Assembly, also, had a stormy time. Furious logrolling went on behind the scenes, with the Latin American and the Arab countries finally making a deal that received majority support.

The provinces of Tripolitania and Cyrenaica, and French-administered Fezzan, are to be combined in a united Libya that will receive its independence by 1952. Somaliland will be administered by Italy, under close UN supervision, for ten years and will then be set free. The problem of Eritrea is postponed for a year while a UN mission goes there and tries to find out what the inhabitants really want.

This solution was a compromise, unpopular at the moment as every compromise always is. The Russians are unhappy because they have been pretty well frozen out of North Africa except through indirect influence in the UN. They had previously asked for a Russian trusteeship, then that all the colonies go back to Italy, then for a genuinely international operation under the UN. Great Britain had an elaborate plan of her own, supported in part by the United States, which approved the British idea of dividing Eritrea between Ethiopia and the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. Italy had swung back and forth with her own changing political situation. The UN resolution was itself altered several times under pressure from the small powers, and usually in a good direction. The fact that the General Assembly, with no great-power veto, was able to reach a settlement after the Council of Foreign Ministers had struggled vainly for years, offers its own significant moral.

"Think of anything yet?"

The New York press has taken a rather sour view of the UN's action, partly because there were logrolling and power politics, partly because the people in these colonies are poor, ignorant, fanatical, and in most cases not yet ready for self-government. It is hard to see much merit in these complaints. Compromise is a legitimate part of the legislative process. If the North Africans are poor and backward, so much the greater is the opportunity for the UN to work along the lines of President Truman's Point Four.

Quite possibly the real objection to the UN decision is the embarrassment it may create for Britain, France, South Africa and other powers with colonies. Half a dozen of these colonies are farther advanced today than Libya or Somaliland are or will be in ten years. Why should they not have their freedom as well? For Americans, only the exigencies of the Cold War give an argument, which carries any impact, for not breaking up existing empires.

IDEAS ABOUT THE ATOM

Two important suggestions were made last week in regard to what is probably the greatest single issue confronting the world—how to stop the armament race in atom bombs.

One of these came from the American Friends Service Committee, which won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1947. It paralleled to an extraordinary degree the suggestion put forth by the *New Republic* ("A Proposal for Atomic Peace," the *NR*, November 7). The Quakers advocate an immediate halt on the production of atomic weapons, prohibiting their use, a great reduction in the output of fissionable material, and inspection at the mines or places of manufacture. They urge that the Scientific and Technical Committee of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission should be reconvened to explore every aspect of the subject.

The second proposal comes from two engineers who served at Oak Ridge during the war, Cuthbert Daniel and John L. Balderston Jr., and their statement—a letter to the dele-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gates of the UN General Assembly—also supports the suggestion of the *New Republic*. The text follows:

We—two engineers recently at Oak Ridge—heartily endorse President Romulo's appeal for a short-term atomic armistice, accompanied by an adequate inspection system, and we urge that his proposals be given thorough study.

There remains a possibility for further compromise between the majority and minority plans for atomic-energy control: a realistic assessment of the present peaceful uses of atomic energy may point the way toward an international agreement which would obviate the need for international ownership and management of atomic facilities. A greatly simplified inspection system would then be possible.

At the present moment, there is only *one* peaceful use of atomic energy. It is the use of radio-isotopes in research and in medicine. These marvelous new tools, always used in very tiny amounts, are made in a low-level atomic furnace (nuclear reactor, pile).

The reactor at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory is typical. It was built in 1943 at a cost of only $12 million. (More than a billion dollars has already been spent or allocated on the huge production piles at Hanford.) At the present time, this small Oak Ridge pile is producing all of the isotopes shipped by the US Atomic Energy Commission for use at home and abroad. Two thousand six hundred and forty-four orders were filled last year and this year's orders will probably number 4,000.

Yet this Oak Ridge pile, working at full capacity, would take *ten to twenty years* to produce enough plutonium to make just one atomic bomb. And without a very special plant to separate this plutonium from the dangerously radioactive fission products which always accompany it, a bomb could *never* be produced.

Four such low-level reactors could produce all the radio-isotopes the world could possibly require in the next few years. Under no circumstances would it be possible to convert them into A-bomb plants. They could be located anywhere in the world without constituting any military threat whatever.

Isotope piles—operating at perhaps 5,000 k.w. or less—could be checked on by an international force on Mondays and Thursdays—and the world could still be safe from surprise atomic attack. Moreover, the isotope plants could safely be operated by national rather than international authorities.

In sharp contrast to the vast and dangerous Hanford-type installations, radio-isotope plants make very moderate demands on the world's limited uranium resources. We estimate that about 20 tons of natural uranium per year would be needed in each such plant—80 tons a year for the whole world.

Compare this with the rate at which the United States is using uranium. We purchased 3,650 tons of uranium from the Belgian Congo in 1946, according to reports published in Brussels.

In regard to "atomic power"—the proposed large-scale use of fissionable materials for economical power production—reasons have been given elsewhere (*Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*—April-May, 1947) for doubting the favorable picture painted by non-engineers. It is sufficient here to refer to the statement of US Atomic Energy Commissioner Sumner Pike, who has said that it will be 10 to 20 years before anyone will be in a position to make an intelligent guess about the prospect for economic atomic power.

Research in this field requires fairly sizable piles, capable—if supplemented by large processing plants—of producing around one atomic bomb per year. Hence, some inspection would be needed. If these experimental piles were "sealed"—the fuel being sealed inside and only a few experimental slots in the pile remaining open—periodic inspection should be quite safe.

Under this proposal all large-scale use of atomic explosives would be prohibited. This involves no sacrifice. The use of atomic energy in blasting operations would be not only uneconomical but highly dangerous, because of the lethal quantities of radiation that would remain on the site. Our proposal maintains all the peaceful benefits of atomic energy.

It will be much easier to inspect the world for large-scale plants if no such plants are legal. It is obviously much easier to *detect* a big atomic industry that is illegal than it is to *police* a big atomic industry that is operating legitimately in all countries. Thus international inspection, while still an absolute necessity, can be put at its minimum rather than at the maximum now proposed. Inspection could safely be placed on a periodic or "Monday and Thursday" basis, and atomic facilities could be nationally owned.

When atomic power becomes economically feasible in this or any other country, the atomic armistice can be reconsidered. In the meantime, the present proposal, by bypassing some of the points that have caused the present deadlock in atomic negotiations, offers a basis for further discussions within the United Nations.

OUTSIDE AMERICA

Few Europeans among those who read ECA chief Hoffman's Paris speech in their newspapers or who heard translations of it over their radios were inclined to deny the soundness of his statement that "the creation of a permanent, freely trading area comprising 270 million consumers in Western Europe would have a multitude of helpful consequences." But those who did read or hear—only a small proportion of the 270 million, because millions can't afford a radio and other millions have never had a chance to learn to read—found vastly oversimplified his direct analogy to the American "single market of 150 million consumers."

It was daring, perhaps commendable, for America's economic spokesman in Europe to pronounce his *fiat lux* about the reasonableness of Western European economic union. Nevertheless, the *Quotidiano* of Rome, organ of the powerful Catholic Action, hence intimately linked with the Vatican, remarked: "Even if Hoffman had no illusions, he did not perhaps expect to see his proposal so badly received. Let us understand one another: since Hoffman is an American and the administrator of ERP, no one told him to his face that he was crazy."

In continental Western Europe few statesmen in power can afford to meet Hoffman's daring in the same currency; they can't turn down anything America proposes. "Fritalux"—the name for the potential economic union of France, Italy, Belgium, Holland and Luxembourg—may come into being on paper, but it may be well for Americans to have no illusions about the chances of its having a better fate than Benelux or the Italo-French customs union. And it may be well for Americans to consider *why* no mun-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dane fiat can suddenly, or even in a matter of months or years, produce the light of economic reason capable of dissipating the accumulated shadows of a European past so much longer and more complicated than our own.

Such shadows still have practical substance. To begin with, there is no simple least common denominator of Hoffman's 270 million Europeans and 150 million Americans. In America population figures may equate consumer figures. In Europe they don't: too many Europeans live entirely outside any trading area likely to affect the world market. Moreover, other elements in modern economy—prices, money, salaries, savings, investments, standards of living—are beyond the realities of their miserable existences.

Then there are psychological factors, quite substantial and directly linked with the economic ones. The Northern Italian, for example, lives in pretty much the same political and social world as a New Englander; the Southern Italian lives in the Middle Ages, largely because the economic wherewithal has been kept from him.

This situation is not new. Yet America shares some blame for its continuance because ECA has been so concerned with the techniques of production and so neglectful of its social and human foundations that it has accepted, from such governments as the Italian, paper promises rather than real reforms. And if Fritalux were to be built on such foundations as now exist in Southern Italy, it would collapse or be overthrown by the rebellious heavings from underneath.

The notion of Fritalux is linked with that of a United States of Europe. Here, too, the analogy with America is false, or at least far-fetched. When the American colonists made the Union, they had little history behind them, and that history melted into the common making of America out of virgin soil. Despite all the recent rhetoric, there are no Europeans. The political differences that separate the nationals of European countries cannot (except on paper) be blithely brushed aside. Freedom and independence still mean not only individual but *national* freedom and independence.

Americans can argue that the terrible experience of wartime and postwar economic distress has tended to dissolve the intensities of nationalist feeling, that it has brought Europeans "to their senses." But if they really believe that national patriotism and national political consciousness have yielded to the exigencies of "economic common sense," they fail to recognize that in Europe, now as in the past, material well-being is not the supreme goal and ideal it seems to be in America. Even more Americans can and do argue that fear has nullified nationalism—fear of Communism and of atomic war. In a measure these Americans are right, but not nearly so right as they think: there is far less fear in Europe than in America; the fear that exists in Europe is of war—any kind of war—and that fear is diminishing simply because Russian possession of atomic bombs is widely interpreted as making Europe less likely to be either the prize or the battleground in a World War III.

Finally, on the economic plane itself, Fritalux is about as "natural" economically as Esperanto is linguistically, and equally likely to replace older forms and habits. The fact, as intelligent Europeans see it, is that the Hoffman proposal is another effort to turn a blind American eye to a deep dilemma—the contradiction between the "natural" in Western European economics and the "necessary" (in American terms) in Western European politics. The American government has only recently further tightened its restrictions against trade (American and Western European) with Eastern Europe. Yet Western Europe—the nations making up Fritalux included—not only is not a "natural" economic community but is now suffering extremely seriously from the severance of its links with Eastern Europe, for the truly "natural" economic community is Eastern and Western Europe combined. It also is suffering from the changing of its trade links with Britain, to the detriment of Western Europe.

In 1938 Western Europe imported $1,031 million worth of goods from Eastern Europe and exported $720 million worth; in 1948 the figures were $419 million and $312 million; and thanks to American policy, they are still going down. In 1938 the United Kingdom imported $1,020 million worth from Europe and exported $663 million; in 1948 imports were $1,391 million, and exports $1,735 million. Taken together, this means that Western Europe has lost its "natural" external markets.

Even if the intra-Western European trade that Hoffman's proposal is supposed to stimulate should be produced —and the odds are against it—the problem would not be solved. Neither in the process of becoming nor in the state of being can a Western European union be a "natural" economic entity without the links with the East.

But American *political* policy dictates that these links must be kept broken. Instead of changing this post-Truman Doctrine policy in the light of events—the obvious and almost publicly admitted failure of the Marshall Plan-by-1952 goal and the consequences of Russia's possession of atom bombs—President Truman has authorized Secretary Acheson to intensify it so much that there has been whispering in Western Europe of the dreaded words, "preventive war."

From the European viewpoint, it is a dangerous illusion for America to believe that contrary and contradictory economic and political ends can be served simultaneously. If America really wants Europe's economic union, believing that economic prosperity can make Europe strong enough to resist Communism at home and abroad, then the "natural" trade with the East should be permitted. If America insists on the "necessary" political union, America had better make up its mind to keep on paying billions and not fool itself or the American people about the workability of such wish-fulfillment projects as Fritalux.

PERCY WINNER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY LYSENKO IS IMPORTANT

by Julian Huxley

MANY PEOPLE, I should imagine, must be wondering why there is all this fuss about Lysenko and Soviet genetics: isn't it just another scientific squabble, of no special interest except to professional scientists?

The answer is *no*, and that for two quite different reasons. It interests everyone who believes that science is an indispensable tool for human progress, because the USSR has officially rejected some of the essentials of scientific method itself, and has split world science into two hostile camps. And it interests everyone concerned with the enlightenment and material benefits that genetics can bring to the world, and in particular to the people of Russia, because the USSR has officially banned most of modern genetic science and has officially approved a theory of heredity and evolution which any impartial scientist knows is incorrect and out of date, and therefore in the long run incapable of producing valuable results.

The controversy is between the upholders of Mendelism, on the one side, which maintains that heredity depends on a system of material particles, the genes, hereditary variation on the *mutation* of genes, and evolution on the automatic process of *natural selection*; and, on the other, the followers of Michurin, who assert that heredity is an aspect of metabolism, or the chemical processes underlying vital activity, that hereditary variation is due to the effects of changed external conditions, and that evolution is due to the inheritance of such acquired characters over many generations. These represent two radically opposed views of this fundamental property of life.

I shall begin with the political and ideological side of the controversy. At the end of July, 1948, the Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences staged a discussion on genetics in which members of the two camps took part. Lysenko was both president of the Academy and the leading proponent of Michurinism. Toward the very end of the session he disclosed that the Central Committee of the Communist Party approved of his Report—in other words that they officially accepted Michurinism and condemned Mendelism. Thereupon the Academy passed a resolution to the same effect.

A few weeks later the USSR Academy of Sciences, the highest scientific authority in the land, but also a government agency, voted an extraordinary series of resolutions on the subject—extraordinary, at least, to people in non-totalitarian countries. These not merely laid down that certain laboratories working on Mendelian lines should be closed down as "unscientific" and "useless," and accused a number of Mendelians by name as holding "reactionary idealist theories," which, moreover, were called "scientifically inconsistent"; not only laid down that the councils and boards of biological institutes and scientific journals should be purged of Mendelians and these replaced by Michurinites; but laid down *ex cathedra* that Mendelism was "reactionary," "idealist" and "pseudo-scientific," that the struggle between it and Michurinism "has taken the form of the ideological class-struggle," and finally that "Michurin's materialist direction in biology is the only acceptable form of science."

This, it will be seen, brings theology of Dark Age type into science. In the USSR Michurinism is now official and orthodox dogma, and Mendelism is officially heretical. All the prominent Mendelians in the USSR have lost their positions, and if still employed at all, are employed in fields other than genetics.

The rise of science is, I suppose, the most distinctive feature dividing the modern world from all other periods; and ever since its first real beginnings in the seventeenth century, science has had various distinctive characteristics. For one thing, it is no respecter of authority, nor of pure reason operating in a speculative vacuum: any dispute in science can be settled only by reference to the facts of nature, by means of observation or, if possible, experiment. It has always insisted on freedom of inquiry, however distasteful to authority or public opinion its conclusions may be; and it has always been universal in character.

But in the USSR today, science, as represented by genetical science, is no longer universal but definitely nationalist; it is no longer free, but has had certain types of inquiry prohibited; and it has been forced to accept the ruling of non-scientific authority as to what is scientifically true and false, instead of being allowed to refer the question to the arbitrament of fact.

Soviet genetics has thus really ceased to be science in the sense in which the scientists of the past three centuries have practised it, and has become a branch of dogmatic theology.

Julian Huxley, a member of a famous British family of scientists, is best known as a zoologist. For seven years he was Secretary of the London Zoological Society, and he was director of UNESCO for its first three years. He has written many books, of which the most recent, on the same subject as this article, is Heredity East and West: Lysenko and World Science *(Schuman, $3), published this week.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The history of genetics as a science has been a spectacular one. When Darwin published his masterpiece, *Origin of Species*, in 1859, the nature and workings of heredity were still a complete mystery. The nature of sexual reproduction, as involving the fusion of cell-nuclei from the two parents, was still unknown; nobody had even seen the chromosomes, which are the essential part of the cell-nucleus. As to the mechanism of evolution, there were two views, both largely speculative. There was Darwin's brilliant idea of Natural Selection, and there were various developments of Lamarck's ideas of evolution through the inheritance of acquired characters. The term "acquired characters" in the technical sense means alterations due to the effects on the individual either of the environment or the conditions of life (like our own tanning due to exposure to strong sunlight, or the fleshiness that many plants develop in salty conditions) or of use and disuse (like the capacities developed by learning, or the atrophy of muscles when not used over a long period).

Natural Selection, on the other hand, was conceived as an automatic sifting process, depending on the fact that individuals endowed by heredity with favorable variations must on the average survive in slightly greater numbers than those endowed with less favorable or actually unfavorable variations. The advantage may be quite small in each generation, but has a cumulative and huge effect in the course of geological time.

The real beginning of modern genetics is based on Mendel's work. His great discoveries may be summed up as follows: First, that the inheritance of a given visible character depends on some definite material unit passed on from generation to generation. Different units determining the appearance of contrasting types (such as yellow and green peas) do not blend in the offspring, as Darwin supposed, but persisted unchanged, and were distributed to later generations according to a simple law.

Second, when a cross involves two or more such unit-factors (or *genes*, as we now call them), they could be recombined in every possible way to give new and true breeding combinations. Thus from a cross between yellow dwarf and green tall peas Mendel was able to extract in the second generation not only pure strains like the parents but also yellow-talls and green-dwarfs.

Third, that the first essential in any experiment on heredity was to find out to what extent the differences between two strains are due to differences in the outer conditions, how much to differences in the inner constitution. The former are called modifications, and are not inherited. Such facts at once threw doubt on Lamarckian ideas of evolution through the inheritance of acquired characters—a doubt intensified by all later work. The more we know about the physical basis of heredity, the more unlikely Lamarckism appears: and none of the experiments claiming to prove it has stood up to the ultimate test, of others being able to repeat them.

Most of the brilliant research that has gone on since that time has been an amplification of Mendel's basic discoveries. Mendel discovered that genes existed; Bateson proved that they were of general occurrence; Morgan and his school showed that there were hundreds, or perhaps thousands, of different genes in the hereditary constitution, and also that they were arranged in an orderly system, each in its place, to make up the chromosomes that one can see under the microscope. The chromosomes are thus the organ of heredity, and Mendel's laws of heredity are merely a consequence of the way in which the chromosomes of father and mother are distributed during the process of reproduction.

At first it was thought that all genes were in the chromosomes. Recently, however, it has been shown that though the chromosomes contain the bulk of the genes, which exert the main control in heredity, there are also some genes in the rest of the cell. These *plasmagenes*, as they are called, are important in individual development, producing the differences between one tissue and another—muscle, say, or nerve; it seems almost certain that disease-causing viruses originate from plasmagenes which have got out of the animal or plant which produced them and are now parasitic on another creature—a remarkable discovery.

Recently, too, a beginning has been made in understanding the chemistry of the genes. They consist of units of protein, the most complicated type of chemical substance known, associated with a substance called nucleic acid. The combined system is capable of reproducing itself, or, more accurately, copying itself.

Meanwhile, the problem of the way in which continuous variation is inherited was solved in principle, after bothering biologists for more than 50 years. Under continuous variation we include familiar facts like this: that the heights of a large number of adult men fall into a smooth, continuous series with no sharp breaks. This is quite different from the discontinuous variation in height shown by Mendel's tall and dwarf strains of peas: here there is a certain amount of continuous variation within the strain, but there is an unbridged gap between the tallest dwarfs and the shortest talls.

Some of the continuous variation in human height is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

obviously inherited. But the statistical methods evolved to demonstrate the degree of this inheritance conclusively shed no light on its material basis. Only recently has it been possible to prove that what is involved is a series of coöperating genes carried in the chromosomes, each contributing a small amount to the increase or decrease of the character in question. With the aid of this knowledge and of the necessary mathematical methods, we can now look forward to rapid practical applications of great value, since the bulk of the characters we would like to improve, in ourselves and our domestic animals and crop plants, are of this quantitative type and depend in large measure on these so-called polygenes.

This is important, for the Michurinites have been reproaching the Mendelians with their failure to achieve practical results—a charge that is by no means generally true. For instance, the spectacular increase in corn yield in the US could only have been achieved on a basis of Mendelian principles—and has been lost to the USSR because it rejected the method as being based on Mendelism! But it has been true that Mendelism has made few contributions to the improvement of quantitative characters. This was due to ignorance of their material basis; now that we know they are due to these batteries of coöperating genes, we can expect rapid and important results.

Finally, I must say something about the origin of new, inheritable variation. This is in the long run the most important process concerned with heredity, since without new variation any real evolutionary change would be impossible.

The origin of new variations also provides the main bone of contention for the two parties to the dispute to growl over—though this is difficult to understand, considering that mutation is scientifically as well established as, say, the pressure of a gas being due to the sum of the movements of its molecules.

As just mentioned, genes are able to copy themselves. But now and again the copy is not exact: we say that the gene has undergone *mutation*. Further, the mutated gene, or mutation as we may call it for short, may be stored in the organ of heredity. In later generations, it may be recombined with other mutations, old or new, to give strains with quite new characters, sometimes possessing real advantages in the business of living.

The struggle for existence then comes into play. It will quite automatically ensure that any mutation or combination of mutations which gives its possessor an advantage over others will on the average survive into the next generation in a higher percentage. And mathematical analysis shows that even a slight percentage change in each generation is capable, over the thousands and millions of generations of biological evolution, of producing the most radical alterations. The gene-theory of heredity, as we may call modern Mendelism, is a true scientific theory, in the sense of a framework of general concepts which is based on a mass of scientific facts and laws and gives a satisfactory explanation, or at least interpretation, of them.

When we come to Michurinism, however, we have regretfully to note that it is not a scientific theory in this sense, but (as its own adherents usually call it) a doctrine—a body of ideas in which, by and large, conformity with an ideology is put before conformity with the facts of nature. This may sound exaggerated to Western ears, but it is true. For instance, one of Lysenko's chief arguments in favor of a Lamarckian method of evolution is that any other method is "unthinkable." Quite apart from the fact that a great many eminent scientists, including Darwin himself, have found natural selection perfectly "thinkable," there are the facts—but these he disregards.

The discussion has abounded in other remarks revealing an atmosphere reminiscent of some early Council of the Church rather than of a scientific meeting. For instance, Lysenko made the astonishing statement that "Mendelism definitely is pure undisguised metaphysics," and over and over again a doctrinal flavor is injected by calling the Mendelians names—"idealists" or "scholastics," "bourgeois" or "reactionaries."

The chief positive scientific claims put forward by Lysenko are: First, the claim to have obtained the inheritance of acquired characters in cereals, by inducing permanent changes through a few years' vernalization treatment. Second, the claim to have secured a fusion of two "heredities" by means of grafting two varieties or species of plants together—so-called vegetative hybridization. And third, the claim to have obtained valuable new strains as a result of "shattering the heredities" of widely different varieties by crossing them. This last point can be speedily disposed of. Doubtless valuable results have been obtained; but equally doubtless these results are due to the operation of simple Mendelian principles, according to which a large range of new varieties is inevitable after a wide cross.

As regards vegetative hybridization, nobody outside the USSR has yet been able to obtain the same results. Furthermore, at least the earlier experiments were not carried out with customary scientific precautions, nor were the results and methods published in adequate detail to enable others to evaluate them properly or

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

repeat them exactly. If the Russians have obtained some new results, they will assuredly be capable of interpretation on a modern Mendelian basis.

Finally, the inheritance of vernalization treatment runs counter to thousands of earlier experiments and to all our previous knowledge. If Lysenko really did get positive results, they are likely to be due to his having used impure strains, upon which unconscious selection then operated. In any case, the onus is still on Lysenko to carry out an experiment with demonstrably pure strains and all necessary precautions.

As an example of the nonsense into which an uncritical doctrinal approach can lead a man, I must mention Lysenko's remarks about chance. It is a scientific fact that Mendel's laws express the result of a chance distribution of the genes concerned. It is also a fact that mutation is often accidental and random. Lysenko, however, states that "living Nature appears to the Morganists as a medley of fortuitous phenomena without any necessary connection and subject to no laws.[!] Chance reigns supreme." . . . "They reduce biological science to mere statistics"; and therefore, he concludes, Mendelism is useless and not an exact science. Yet any student of elementary physics knows that some of the most exact laws, such as the gas laws, are the statistical expression of the random movements of the millions of molecules in the gas.

The really alarming thing about the discussion was the way the Michurinites repudiated some of the essentials of scientific method and the scientific approach. One of these is freedom—freedom of research, opinion and discussion. The Academy of Science itself officially stated that Lysenko's Report, "which has been approved by the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party, *lays down the party line in biology*." The very idea of a "party line" in science is inconceivable to a Western scientist.

More specifically, this is what Prezent has to say on the subject: "The Mendelians want a discussion. But we shall not discuss with the Morganists (applause); we shall continue to expose them as adherents of an essentially false scientific trend, a pernicious and ideologically alien trend, brought to our country from foreign shores."

This also illustrates another regrettable feature of Soviet genetics—the way in which it arouses prejudice against its opponents by labeling them "alien" or "hostile" or "unpatriotic." Soviet science, in fact, is behaving just as Nazi science did—*it is becoming* acutely nationalistic.

Soviet scientists no longer regard science as a unitary world activity. Prezent, for instance, actually said, "Is it not extraordinary that in our country, where dialectical materialism is the method and logical basis of science, with an undeniably revolutionary character, there appear from time to time dreams of the unity of science with contemporary foreign science?"

There is a great deal to be said for a nation having some generally accepted ideology, to use the modern jargon; but phrases like a common body of ideas and beliefs or a common view of human destiny will serve equally well. But there is, it seems to me, little or nothing to be said for forcibly imposing such an ideology or body of ideas from above. That may be the inevitable result in a totalitarian state. If so, all the worse for totalitarianism—and, alas, for the rest of the world in which totalitarianism exists.

NEW BROOM IN PHILADELPHIA

by Johannes U. Hoeber

"PHILADELPHIA is not merely corrupt, but corrupted. . . . [It] is contented and seems hopeless," Lincoln Steffens reported in 1903. That description has continued to fit the third largest American city for most of the 46 years since then. But on November 8, a political earthquake shook the Quaker City. In an off-year election, with only four offices at stake—Controller, Treasurer, Register of Wills and Coroner—the Republican machine which has been virtually unchallenged for the past 70 years in Philadelphia suffered a defeat so crushing that it will not recover for years—if ever. At the end of a campaign on whose outcome both the City Hall organization and the Democratic Party had been forced to stake their very existence for a long time to come, more than 800,000 Philadelphians, nearly 80 percent of the registered voters, defeated the machine by a majority of 112,000 votes.

For three reasons, this outcome may have been of historical significance: it may have spelled the doom of the last corrupt big-city machine to maintain its grip, after New York, Chicago, Kansas City, Minneapolis, New Orleans and Jersey City had cleaned house; it may have far-reaching effects on the political balance of power in Pennsylvania; it has projected into the limelight two men who have the caliber to play much more than a local role in American politics.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The story of how the docile Philadelphians were finally moved to fury begins more than two years ago, when Richardson Dilworth was selected by Democratic City Chairman Michael Bradley to run for Mayor against the aging Republican incumbent, Bernard Samuel. Dilworth, a successful lawyer in his early fifties, a former Marine Corps officer with a distinguished record in both world wars, lost the race by more than 90,000 votes. But Dilworth let the machine know it had been in a fight. In street-corner speeches, night after night, he accused individual members of graft, corruption and inefficiency, naming names, giving addresses, and citing exact amounts, dates and places.

Less than six months later the chief of the Amusement Tax Bureau in City Hall committed suicide, leaving behind a written confession that he and six other city employees had embezzled $200,000 in tax funds. A "Committee of Fifteen" appointed by the Mayor and the City Council to find new sources of revenue to balance the 1948 budget uncovered further irregularities. One machine politician after another was indicted and brought into court; several were convicted.

Two weeks after his defeat Dilworth had announced that he was in the fight to stay until the city government was cleaned up. It was clear that the fight would be hard. Early in the 1947 mayoralty campaign, the Republican organization had begun to realize that the Democratic Party was no longer the "politics-as-usual" crowd with whom they had been able to do business in the past, and that Dilworth was the man they had to beat. The machine started to fight back with the weapons which had always ensured its rule of City Hall since the days of Boise Penrose and the Vare brothers: political exploitation of the 22,000 jobs of Philadelphia's archaic city-county government, intimidation of the city's million voters, and vilification of anyone who dared to challenge the organization.

The man the Republicans first picked for the hatchet work is a member of the ruling triumvirate in the Republican City Committee—Austin Meehan, Sheriff of the City and County of Philadelphia and the Republican leader of northeast Philadelphia, the city's fastest growing section of one-family row houses. He set out to finish off Dilworth by character assassination.

On July 12, 1949, Meehan accepted a challenge Dilworth had repeated a dozen times in two years, and the two of them appeared before a mass meeting in the plushy Academy of Music to debate the issue of good government for Philadelphia. Meehan used the time allotted for one of the most personal attacks on an opponent ever heard at a public meeting in Philadelphia. He used "liar," "faker" and "coward" in every second sentence and climaxed his argument by relating intimate details of Dilworth's divorce 15 years ago. The intent of all this was to destroy Dilworth as a candidate for public office. Dilworth answered by announcing he would run for City Treasurer in the fall elections.

To be head of the ticket and candidate for City Controller, Dilworth proposed, and the Democratic City Committee promptly nominated, Joseph Sill Clark, distinguished member of a distinguished Philadelphia family. Behind the ticket headed by these two men an army of campaign workers was organized by the Democratic Party, the AFL, the CIO, the Independent Republicans and the ADA. They had a single issue, good government.

The Republicans nominated four thoroughly respectable, if completely unknown, gentlemen. However, they quickly abandoned this strategy of "reform from within" in favor of a continued effort to destroy the Democratic candidates as individuals. Meehan's performance at the Academy of Music debate had wrecked him as the Republican spokesman in this campaign. An estimated audience of 250,000 people had followed the debate on radio and television and for days the newspapers had been swamped with indignant letters protesting Meehan's attack on his opponent's private life.

The ball was therefore passed to GOP City Chairman William F. Meade, who comes from Philadelphia's tenderloin district and has been on the public payroll since he was 18. His present job is chairman of the Board of Revision of Taxes, which controls assessments on all Philadelphia real estate.

On September 21, Meade revealed the technique with which he proposed to win this election: a gigantic Red scare. In a speech before the 52 Republican ward leaders of the city, Meade singled out the ADA as the real issue in the campaign. He called the ADA a Communist-infiltrated organization; since Dilworth is chairman and Clark past chairman of the ADA, they must be defeated, said Meade, in order to defeat Communism. The ADA answered by filing a $100,000 libel suit against Meade and his Republican City Committee.

On October 22, huge ads began to appear in the papers announcing two broadcasts to be made by Meade over virtually every radio station in Philadelphia, in which he would name the Communists in Dilworth's ADA. The broadcasts which followed represented a Hitlerian technique, coupled with the Dies-Rankin

---

Johannes U. Hoeber is an economist and political scientist who has lived in Philadelphia for the past eleven years. He is a prominent figure in Americans for Democratic Action.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

refinement of "guilt by association." During two 15-minute periods, Meade named a total of 12 directors and members of the Philadelphia ADA who 10 or 12 years ago had belonged to one of the organizations listed later by the Attorney General as subversive. Meade climaxed his second broadcast by accusing 20 of the 30 members of the national board of the ADA of being CP sympathizers.

The response to Meade's broadcasts was as devastating as had been the response to Meehan's attack on Dilworth in July. Within three hours after the first broadcast, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt issued a moving statement in defense of the first person whom Meade had named, and former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts answered Meade's attack on a professor of law at the University of Pennsylvania with a statement so strong in its indignation that it had to be toned down to be printable. Two days after Meade's second broadcast, Walter H. Annenberg's Republican Philadelphia *Inquirer* came out for Clark and Dilworth. Five days later the *Evening Bulletin* followed suit. It was all over but the shouting.

But it was not too late for two Republican leaders of national stature to do grave harm to their political futures: Governor James H. Duff, who has won the respect of many Pennsylvanians during the three years of his administration, and Harold E. Stassen, now president of the University of Pennsylvania, yielded to Meade's pressure and identified themselves with his discredited organization.

What does the earthquake in Philadelphia mean to the nation at large?

To progressives all over America it may well have been the most cheering news of November 8. Once more the Red scare was tried on a gigantic scale—and it backfired more badly than ever before.

Next year Senator Francis J. Myers of Pennsylvania, the Democratic whip in the Senate, comes up for re-election. The Democratic landslide in Philadelphia has immeasurably improved Myers' chances of reëlection. Dilworth is already being mentioned as a possible candidate for Governor next year when Duff may be Myers' opponent for the Senate.

A Democratic mayor and a Democratic City Council are now a real possibility for the first time in the history of William Penn's staid Quaker town.

But care will have to be taken to escape the pitfall Lincoln Steffens pointed out: "Reform with us is usually revolt, not government, and is soon over."

THE BIBLE AND MODERN BELIEF

By LOUIS WALLIS

A remarkable new book about the Ancient Hebrews

¶ Leading universities such as Harvard, Yale, Chicago, and Duke are already making use of Mr. Wallis's new discoveries, based upon the Hebrew texts of the Scriptures and here made available in book form for the first time. Appealing strongly to thoughtful laymen, whether with or without church or synagogue affiliations, *The Bible and Modern Belief* shows that ancient Israel had no Bible until most of the nation had been overthrown and swept away (*i. e.*, "the Lost Tribes"). One tribe alone was left—Judah, from which is derived the name "Jew."

¶ The Bible was produced by unknown Jewish scribes, working in a literary and historic bottleneck after the great "Babylonian Exile." These ancient authors, living in an age when there was no scientific knowledge or understanding of human history, constructed a picture of Hebrew history as they thought it SHOULD have been during the long epoch before the Exile. This picture has been taken over into Jewish and Christian "orthodoxy"; but it clashes decisively with actual Hebrew history as reflected by the earlier, so-called "Ephraimite," sources carried along in the Bible itself.

¶ "I found the book fascinating," writes the Dean of McCormick Theological Seminary (Dr. Ovid R. Sellers). "It is particularly clear in pointing out the Jewish motivation on the part of the Pentateuchal Priestly writers in playing down the traditions which showed the priority of Ephraim. It brings into new highlight the earlier predominance of Ephraim and the manipulation of the literary material by the later scribes of Judah in discounting the north to the advantage of the south." And Dr. Sellers adds, "Carrying the book with me on a railroad journey, I became so absorbed that I took it into my berth and finished it at three in the morning."

$2.50

Order through your bookseller, or direct from

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS • College Station Box 6697 • Durham 5, North Carolina

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HAROLD L. ICKES: *Tossing Peace Overboard*

DOES THE AVERAGE AMERICAN know what our policy has been, or is, with respect to Germany? Such of it as has been made known to us has varied as one Secretary of State has succeeded another. It has even shifted as administrators—to say nothing of their subordinates—have come and gone, or changed posts.

Many thoughtful persons believe that, although we won the war with Germany, we have lost the peace. Many signs point in that direction. I have just read a book by Delbert Clark, who recently returned, after two years spent in Berlin as the correspondent of the New York *Times*. The title of it is *Again the Goose Step*. Mr. Clark goes far to prove that, despite the "Never again!" that we and our allies uttered with such determination after the defeat of Germany, we are confronted with the sight of young Germans goose-stepping through the streets singing "Deutschland über Alles." Nationalism is on the rise and hatred of America increases with it. Clark writes of our failure to understand the German psychology and of our indifference about it. Nor has this been our only failure.

According to Brigadier General Telford Taylor, who served as chief prosecutor in the Nürnberg war-crimes trials, there is "an alarming resurgence of authoritarianism in Germany." He deplores the fact that, in midstream, we abandoned our sternly announced policy of bringing to the bar of justice every known Nazi criminal. Instead, we have been conferring more and more authority upon former active Nazis. We have neither denazified nor democratized the Germans. Evidence to support this conclusion can be found in all directions.

We won the war—we, and our allies—because we had a single-minded purpose to win it. We have lost the peace because we were of many minds and divided purposes. A peace-loving, non-military nation, we set up, both in Berlin and in Tokyo, military pro-consuls of practically absolute power. We have left it to professional soldiers, at least until recently in Germany, to rebuild governments in the shadow of peace. We left the reëducation of the German people in the democratic tradition to those who were neither educated nor democratic.

The American people, especially, were tired of the war. On all sides there were explosive "noes" when the question was asked, "Do we want another world war?" But we were wearied of rationing and what little self-denial we had been called upon to endure. We wanted more gasoline, more and bigger movies and funnies. Sex crimes, widely publicized in newspapers sold for home consumption, were more important news than the spurious democracy in Western Germany or the simon-pure dictatorships in Spain and Portugal.

When the military in Germany felt that the State Department should take over the administration there, the State Department would have none of it. A diplomatic vacuum existed which had to be filled by General Clay. This was not his fault. When, at long last, the State Department got ready to do what it should have undertaken much earlier, its choice for High Commissioner, John J. McCloy, who had made an outstanding record as Assistant Secretary of War, found that he had to go forward from where Clay had left off. Patriotic citizen though he was, it was too much to expect McCloy even to attempt to undo the harm that had been done by the Clay regime. Someone with a different background and predisposition than those of McCloy might have seen at a glance at Western Germany that "Kilroy was here." Indeed, "Kilroy," alias Wall Street, had been all over Western Germany. William H. Draper Jr., a well-known "Wall Streeter" of the firm of Dillon, Read and Company, first as economic adviser to Clay and, subsequently, as Under Secretary of the Army, vigorously and successfully opposed the policy of decartelization. Wall Street, as usual, wants to make money out of Germany. Nothing else counts. Its influence, which waxed under Clay, has not waned under McCloy.

Lately there have been rumors of a demand on the part of Western Germany that we permit it to rearm, or perhaps even assist in that suicidal enterprise. We may as well prepare ourselves to listen to "realistic" arguments for the rearmament of our recent foes in order that we may have their assistance if we should have to fight Russia. Trebly fools, and fully deserving of the dreadful fate that might befall us, would we be if we yielded to such pleas! If again armed, Germany would be no more trustworthy a friend of the United States than it has been in the past. If we permitted, let alone helped in, the rearmament of Germany, we would simply be placing a deadly weapon in the hands of an implacable foe who would willingly join with Russia in a desperate effort to destroy us in the belief that, having done so, ways and means would be found either of living at peace with Russia or of defeating that country in its turn.

HAROLD L. ICKES

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN REVIEW

KANGAROO COURT IN THE PHILIPPINES

by Don Hollenbeck

THERE HAS BEEN time enough now for reviewers and readers to wake up to the fact that *The Case of General Yamashita* is, in many ways, one of the most important books to come out of the late war. If America has a conscience, this is the document to give it an excruciating twinge.

The Case of General Yamashita concerns the trial, conviction and hanging as a war criminal, immediately after the conclusion of the war in the Pacific, of the commander of the Japanese Fourteenth Army Group in the Philippines. It is written by a member of Yamashita's defense counsel, now executive secretary of the American Federation of Radio Artists, and an angry man. Briefly, A. Frank Reel's contention is that Yamashita was jobbed—given a drumhead trial by a commission of five American generals, none of whom was a lawyer. Reel says that pressure was put on the commission by General Douglas MacArthur, who was determined on a conviction from the outset. The United States Supreme Court was asked to pass on the findings of the military commission, but by a vote of five to two declined to do so, and on February 23, 1946, General Tomoyuki Yamashita was stripped of his uniform and hanged in disgrace at Los Baños, on the island of Luzon.

THE CASE OF GENERAL YAMASHITA, by A. Frank Reel (The University of Chicago Press; $4).

The United States Army set out to prove that Yamashita, as commanding general, was responsible for atrocities committed by the Japanese in Manila and elsewhere on Luzon. We wanted to show the newly liberated Filipinos that we meant business; that we intended to move in with a flaming sword to punish the inhuman enemy, and the Army could find no more prominent personification of that inhuman enemy than the Tiger of Malaya—the man who had taken Singapore away from a hundred thousand British troops with a third as many men. According to Reel's well-documented book, our sword flamed, if it burned at all in this case, with a baleful light in the eyes of men. He seems to establish the following facts: Yamashita was not in command of the Japanese who sickened the world with atrocities in Manila (they were naval personnel); at that time, he was retreating into the hills of Luzon and had completely lost contact with his command; he had no knowledge of the crimes that were being committed, and therefore no opportunity to do anything about them. The Army's position was that even if all this were so, Yamashita *ought* to have known about them and done something about them, and that, therefore, he was as guilty as if he himself had taken part in the rapes and murders that accompanied the capture of Manila.

The story of the trial and conviction of General Yamashita is engrossing and disturbing. Even though we bear in mind that Reel speaks as counsel for the defense, and an impassioned one, too many facts are incontrovertible to allow one to differ with his conclusion that "General Yamashita was condemned unjustly, first, because the evidence against him was obtained and accepted in violation of the laws that Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence has developed over many centuries in order to protect just such a person as he against the prejudices of judges and the demands of the mob for vengeance." And as he points out, "There are those who have said that in the handling of this case, our Army missed a great opportunity. Having fought and won a war against totalitarianism . . . we could have shown the world just what we meant. Instead of that, we fell to the level of our enemies. We adopted their judicial techniques. We gave the world a practical demonstration of the fact that, certainly in one corner of the globe, 'the enemy has lost the battle but has destroyed our ideals'."

The most telling portion of Reel's book deals with the handling of the case by seven Justices of the United States Supreme Court: Stone, Black, Frankfurter, Douglas, Murphy, Burton and Rutledge. Justice Reed was ill; Justice Jackson was in Nüremberg dealing with another war-crimes trial. The Court cut some red tape to consider the Yamashita case, but between the presentation of arguments and the handing down of the decision, four weeks elapsed—an unconscionably long time in view of the matter's urgency. The reason for the delay became plain on the day of the decision; the dissenting Justices, Murphy and Rutledge, left no doubt that there had been a strenuous effort to bring them into the majority camp for a unanimous decision; on this precedent-setting issue it seemed important that the Supreme Court show the world a united front. But Murphy and Rutledge weren't having any, and their dissenting opinions, especially Murphy's, are the high points of Reel's book. As Justice Murphy wrote:

> If we are ever to develop an orderly international community based upon a recognition of human dignity it is of the utmost importance that the necessary punishment of those guilty of atrocities be as free as possible from the ugly stigma of revenge and vindictiveness. . . In this, the first case involving this momentous problem ever to reach this Court, our responsibility is both lofty and difficult. We must insist that the highest standards of justice be applied in this trial of an enemy commander. . . Otherwise, stark retribution will be free to masquerade in a cloak of false legal

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ism. And the hatred and cynicism engendered by that retribution will supplant the great ideals to which this nation is dedicated.

Don Hollenbeck, CBS news reporter and analyst, is best known for his program, "CBS Views the Press."

SATIRIST'S UTOPIA

THE OASIS, by Mary McCarthy (Random House; $2).

WITH SHARP WIT, high spirits and a talent for epigram and capsule characterization, Mary McCarthy offers us in this *roman à clef* a satirical portrayal of intellectuals at bay. In essence, *The Oasis* is a series of vignettes hung on a forced framework of several contrived moral crises, most of which are either basically false or far too neat and complete. The result, despite specific true elements, is not truth larger than life-size but the exaggerations of falsehood.

There is still another reason why these flareups, planned as focusing highlights, actually reveal much less than the keen bits of analysis sprinkled liberally throughout. Miss McCarthy's depiction of character suffers from the intrinsic shallowness of all chiefly cerebral fabrications, even when these are documented by carefully chosen details from observation. As long as imagination, empathy and introjection of a high order are largely absent from the creative process, what is produced is mere attitudes and figures, and crises between attitudes and figures cannot engender tension, cannot achieve emotional significance or true and universal characterization. (By contrast—I cite it for its *kind*, not degree, of achievement—there is Dostoevsky's Foma Opiskin in his short novel, *The Friend of the Family*.)

In Miss McCarthy's fable a variety of idealists and critical realists (the chief of whom are said to be modeled closely on editors of two "elite" leftist cultural periodicals), enmeshed in a continuing struggle to keep their egos and political theories afloat, form a Utopian colony vaguely dedicated to the maintenance of liberal ideals against the flood tide of war and anti-intellectualism. It is never clear to Miss McCarthy, to the reader or to the Utopians themselves precisely how they can achieve their misty, undefined objectives. I take it that this, in one sense, is the cream of the jest, the implication being that the real-life counterparts of these Utopians, both celebrated and unknown, are similarly lacking in direction. At any rate, this New England hilltop retreat is foredoomed by the dissension between its two major factions, the Realists and the Purists.

The first moral skirmish occurs when the committee on admissions almost succumbs to the sin of Sectarianism. Then comes the near-expulsion of a colonist on highly dubious grounds, an incident, unbelievable from its inception, that is too plainly *made* to occur by the author to supply the needed action and underscore a simple point. This is followed by the complete fiasco of another colonist's dream-project, "Operation Peace," as every member in puppet fashion (almost as if the episode had been written by a pro-Soviet leftist intent on proving what frauds anti-Soviet leftists invariably are) shrinks from fulfilling his pledge when concrete action is broached. The well-telegraphed, too cunningly arranged disintegrating climax is the Battle of Strawberry Patch, in which the "revolutionary" members of Utopia are found unequal (morally and physically) to the defense of the colony's strawberries against three invading members of the

What is Tito's Yugoslavia like today? This informal, delightful, wholly un-political account of the author's trip to see her Yugoslav relatives (hundreds of them!) will tell you more than any number of portentous political reports from behind the Iron Curtain.

COUSINS and COMMISSARS

An Intimate Visit to Tito's Yugoslavia

By MILLA LOGAN

● "Miss Logan lets the people she meets—her relatives and strangers, some friendly to Tito and others bitterly opposed—tell their own story of both the good and the bad of modern Yugoslavia."—*New York Times*

● "Here is Yugoslavia from the grass roots up . . . If you'd like to know something of what postwar Yugoslavia is like, I'd advise you to read *Cousins and Commissars*."—Joseph Henry Jackson, *San Francisco Chronicle*

$2.75 at all bookstores

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lumpenproletariat. Several less inhibited and high-minded colonists send the three scurrying, leaving the strawberries for the Utopians, whose moral precepts and injured egos are freely stained by the ripe fruit's juice. As any reader could predict by this time, it is the lone capitalist Utopian who expresses indignation at the anti-humanitarian "violation" of the rights of the invading proletarian pickers.

This charade is narrated in a lucid, finely controlled style, shot through with a filigree of intellectual sinew and, frequently, true insights and fresh abstractions rather than psychological jargon. Miss McCarthy also displays a courageous willingness to slay dragons evidently long grazing in her own backyard, a quality seen earlier in her remarkably successful collection of stories, *The Company She Keeps*. Occasionally, however, she sticks cruel pins into pitiable, defenseless, uninteresting people, hardly fit objects for lampooning. Except for rare moments, she displays a personal animus and a lack of sympathy that limit understanding and reduce most of *The Oasis* to surface satire that depends for its full effect on the reader's successful identification of the models for her characters.

Another major flaw is highlighted by the fact that the tragedy of impending war (World War III), which forms the backdrop to and inspiration for the colony, is too close a reality today. Miss McCarthy's continued *amusement* when she finally reveals her colonists as so many disciples of Nero (though subtler fiddlers) borders on the ghoulish. The satire's narrow, personal compass becomes picayune and the tone of high-spirited burlesque and ironic comedy no longer suits her underlying subject matter: the failure of leftist intellectuals (and, by implication, of all of us) to unite theory with practice and counteract "the resignation of a public which, despite the ballot box, looked upon wars and social catastrophes as the medieval peasant looked upon cholera and earthquake, as manifestations of fatality, afflictions from the Beyond."

Of one of her characters Miss McCarthy writes that "he lacked audience-sense to an almost fatal degree." One could justly say of Miss McCarthy that she possesses audience-sense to an almost fatal degree. In fact, she is a victim of one of the diseases of our age: the bounden necessity to be clever and tough before all else. On that score she ranks high, but the price she pays for it might, conceivably, have purchased her passage on a deeper-plowing, wider-ranging vessel. Of course, the dangers of foundering would have been greater and the odds much longer against ringing encomia greeting one at the dock. Perhaps, therefore, it would be unfair to ask one ironic soul—admittedly hardy, but more of a Utopian herself than one might at first imagine—to venture that far out of port. To this critic, however, the penchant (or is it compulsion?) of many of the better writers working today—Sylvia Townsend Warner and Ernest Hemingway, to name two disparate examples—carefully to hew to the line of their preconceived limitations is more deplorable than the frequently scored temerity of the writer who aims at the moon and lands in a fishpond.

ALEXANDER KLEIN

Alexander Klein, scenario writer for documentary films, has had stories and criticism published in the Saturday Review of Literature, Tomorrow, *the* Survey *and the* Yale Review.

Julian Huxley

explains the bitter Soviet genetics controversy in terms you can understand

HEREDITY EAST AND WEST

LYSENKO and WORLD SCIENCE

"AN event of social and scientific note . . . especially to those who hold to the beliefs that truth is the means to freedom, and understanding the means to peace."
— *Scientific American*

Just published

At your bookstore $3

HENRY SCHUMAN, Inc.

BRIEF COMMENT

The Islands of Unwisdom, by Robert Graves. (Doubleday; $3.50).

The latest of Robert Graves's many historical novels is a reconstruction (from an original chronicle) of a Spanish expedition which embarked from Peru in 1595. Its objects (apart from gold) were to discover Australia and settle the South Sea Islands. In these it failed, but it was notable for several incidental discoveries, and for the bizarre accident by which the leader of the flotilla bequeathed its entire command to his young and beautiful wife. Graves is a practised (and largely successful) hand at combining such elements in a sustained narrative, though before it is quite over the story "begins to stick fast" (as the narrator himself complains), "clogged in the mire of intrigues, feuds, enmities and suspicions."

But the book is particularly interesting as an episode in the history of Spanish colonization, and the greed and cruelty of the adventurers contrasted with the trusting innocence of the natives is "the tragedy of the islands [the South Solomons] where no Solomon was found: that is to say, no wisdom."

Delight, by J. B. Priestley (Harpers; $2.50).

"I have always been a grumbler," admits J. B. Priestley with humorous complacency. Now, well along in an eminently successful career as English literary panjandrum, as novelist, playwright, arbiter of best-sellers and authoritative voice on the BBC, he has put together this little book to make amends. A self-styled "Mad Old Man of the Tribe," he expresses his "delight" in such subjects as "Detective Stories in Bed," "Old Photograph," "Meeting a Friend," "Suddenly Doing Nothing," "Buying Books," and so on and so on. The opinionated nature of this ruminating is balanced by a facetious self-depreciation that neatly sustains the "light touch."

But the really interesting item in all

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this delight is a little flare-up of poorly disguised bad temper. Ostensibly, Priestley defends (his own) "simplicity" in writing against some vaguely suggested succeeding "generation" that supports a "view of literature as a cerebral activity." Actually this is a classic but all too familiar instance of the popular success who resentfully suspects the applause is not unanimous. "I am not afraid of the crowd," is Priestley's boast, whereas, for the huddled highbrows, "Literature had to respond to something twisted, tormented, esoteric, in their own secret natures." Note the evasive general adjectives just hinting vilification. But the direction of Priestley's animus is finally revealed by his sad, querulous contention: "I am just as much 'an intellectual' as those younger chaps!"

Prize Stories of 1949: the O. Henry Awards. Selected and Edited by Herschel Brickell (Doubleday; $3.50).

This annual volume is now published for the thirty-first time, includes twenty-three stories, and serves its usual useful purpose of dispensing three cash awards. The judges who came to these decisions were Eudora Welty, John Hutchens and Ray B. West Jr., and the history of their deliberations is recorded with appropriate solemnity in the Introduction. William Faulkner, Mark Van Doren and Ward Dorrance were their understandable choices, for stories published in literary quarterlies: the *Sewanee, Yale* and *Hudson* Reviews. J. F.

Heywood Broun, by Dale Kramer (Current Books, A. A. Wyn; $3.50).

In retrospect, Heywood Broun seems the most significant of the group of brilliant New York newspapermen of the period between wars. It is interesting to consider why this is so. Broun wrote well, a swift, incisive prose; but so did several of his confreres. He was touched with an almost theatrical glamor; but this was true in about the same degree of Woollcott and Benchley, to name only two. Broun talked about himself and his family, almost too candidly at times; but it was an age when frankness was still something of a salable novelty, and others were also frank.

The element that distinguished him, and alone justifies a biography, was his sense of social responsibility. It caused him to throw himself into the crusade for Sacco and Vanzetti (which lost him his job on the *World*). It was responsible for his heroic, if naïve, campaign at the bottom of the depression to "give a job 'til June," which developed into his ill-starred theatrical venture, "Shoot the Works." It caused him to participate in the founding of what is now a flourishing trade union, the Newspaper Guild, of which he was the first president. It was part of the personality which at last sent him into the Catholic Church.

Dale Kramer has written a vivid and human biography of this vivid and human man. He is frank about Broun's weaknesses, of which there were plenty; but he likes his subject, and communicates his liking to the reader.

THEATRE: Robles, Hellman, Blitzstein

As EMMANUEL ROBLES wrote it, "Montserrat" was an existentialist play. Man's problem, Roblès was saying, is the tragic one implied in the choice of action. What the characters of his play, and all men, are faced with is the question of how they shall meet the certainty of death—that is, with what sort of action. The validity of any particular action is hardly subject to proof. The play's protagonist, Montserrat, can be no more certain that life will bear him out in his nobility than the antagonist, Izquierdo, can vouch for the efficacy of his cynicism. Montserrat does what he feels he must, even if he is to be damned for it, even if the people for whom he makes his sacrifice do not want it or will not know how to use it, and even without any philosophic assurance that the future will prove him right. He sacrifices his life and that of others with entire consciousness of his individual responsibility. What distinguishes his choice of action is that it is undertaken in behalf of millions of others. This is the essence of the existentialist ethic.

The existentialist hero knows exactly why he is dying, and the reason extends beyond his ego. The merchant of the play believes that he lives for his wife and for his business, but the manner of his death proves him false; the artisan is a person whose life interest is limited to his craft and the

Earth Abides

By GEORGE R. STEWART, *author of* STORM, FIRE, *etc.* "Superb and provocative entertainment."—*Saturday Review.* $3.00

Maupassant:

A LION IN THE PATH

By FRANCIS STEEGMULLER. "A necessity for any lover of Maupassant's writings."—*Irwin Edman.* $5.00

This I Saw:

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF GOYA

By ANTONINA VALLENTIN. "An outstanding biography."—*New York Times Book Review.* With 20 gravure reproductions. $5.00

The U.A.W. and Walter Ruether

By IRVING HOWE & B. J. WIDICK. A fascinating account of the U.A.W. and its smart, progressive leader, of their trials and tribulations and spectacular rise to power. $3.00

THE American College Dictionary

Acclaimed the finest, most authoritative, most up-to-date desk dictionary ever published. 1472 pages, 132,000 entries, 1600 illustrations. *Plain, $5; thumb-indexed, $6*

Random House Bestsellers

A RAGE TO LIVE
by John O'Hara. $3.75

LEAD, KINDLY LIGHT
by Vincent Sheean. $3.75

PLEASE PASS THE HOSTESS
Cartoons by Whitney Darrow, Jr. $2.75

AT ALL BOOKSTORES, RANDOM HOUSE, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

feeding of his family; the mother's passion is confined to the protection of her two children; the actor, wholly centered in his love for the theatre, takes on heroic stature when he becomes aware of what his art implies; the two youngest characters are committed to the liberation of their country, and are thus heroes on a basis less complex than that of Montserrat.

To make all this clear, Roblès has pitted an intensely rational and sensuous man against the idealistic Montserrat. Izquierdo's rationalism makes him see the logical barrenness of the hero's position; his sensuousness is the pain that keeps Izquierdo both tragically attached to life and violently opposed to any religious exaltation of it.

Virginia Woolf once pointed out that there was more psychology in one page of Proust than in all the work of Sophocles. Roblès, typical of the younger French dramatists, does not follow the Ibsen tradition of psychological drama, but the classic tradition in which action and situation create meaning without the aid of detailed characterization.

This difference of approach has evidently escaped Lillian Hellman in her adaptation of "Montserrat." In her eagerness to cover the original play's nakedness, she has resorted to realistic exposition, character jokes, epigrams, and period atmosphere by way of an elaborate rhetoric. The play's style has thus been altered. This is coupled with a misunderstanding of the play's content. Miss Hellman seems to have believed that she was dealing with a "revolutionary" play in our 1930 sense of a play in praise of the struggle for freedom. "Montserrat" is not such a play. It is primarily a drama of moral issues—its plot association with Bolivar's fight for South American independence is almost accidental. Hence its appeal abroad to all parties (except the Catholic), both Right and Left.

The original text required the completion of fully rounded acting and staging. But Miss Hellman has become the victim of the heresy which maintains that words intelligibly conveyed are all that the stage demands. Thus she has not only added unnecessary words, but miscast her play (Emlyn Williams, who is a good actor, gives us a cold villain, whereas Izquierdo should be as hot in his unbelief as Montserrat in his belief), and her direction makes neither shape, sense nor good red excitement.

I should like true lovers of the theatre to see "Regina," the musical drama Marc Blitzstein has fashioned from Miss Hellman's "The Little Foxes." They will not all necessarily consider it a satisfying show, but they will find it an interesting attempt to extend the limitations and conventions of our stage beyond the flat statement of journalistic naturalism and the merely decorative theatricality of our musical comedy and operetta. "Regina" has been seriously directed by Robert Lewis, and, despite the weakness of the cast at crucial points, the ensemble is good because the design or intention of the whole is always being carried out.

The trouble with "Regina" I believe, stems from Blitzstein's respect for its origin. "The Little Foxes" is an excellent play, but its spirit is the antithesis of the musical. One might as well try to set double-entry bookkeeping to music as to make those "little foxes" sing. To have been at ease, Blitzstein should have taken all the liberties necessary to make "Regina" entirely his own. Blitzstein's talent is for a sort of plaintive comedy, a sweet-and-sour lyric irony, and the literal line of "The Little Foxes," which Blitzstein has followed, does not permit him full sway. Where he has been able to exploit his own vein, his score is catchy; where he has had to do, so to speak, Miss Hellman's work, his score seems forced. HAROLD CLURMAN

ON THE AIR: Travels with an Iconoscope

ALONG WITH shinier front offices, higher antenna towers and heavier deficits, television broadcasters have also been building bigger and better studios. At the same time, three of the networks have discovered that the camera can travel beyond studio walls for rendezvous more rewarding than sports or parades.

CBS has taken its cameras to Lake Success, where for 15 hours a week (Mondays to Fridays, 11 a.m. to one p.m., and again from three to four p.m.) we are now shown the UN General Assembly at work. Peace construction, or what passes for such at Lake Success, thus becomes a process that all who have access to a video set may overhear and witness. And the ability to witness is not unimportant, for Austin's scowl, Vishinsky's snicker and Romulo's frown provide their own telegenic commentary. Television, with no responsibility for the cocktail-lounge love-feasts or the committee-room cat fights, can show them both with documentary neutrality. The cameras are there to report the struggle for survival; they do their job well.

The extreme political Left would

RESORTS

ARROWHEAD LODGE

Reserve Now
FOR CHRISTMAS HOLIDAY
Complete Social Staff
All Winter Sports
GR 7-1267 : ELLENVILLE 502
ELLENVILLE, NEW YORK

ARE YOU ON YOUR CHRISTMAS LIST?
Treat Yourself To A Splendid Winter Vacation!
WINTER SPORTS . . . . . .
. . PAINTING & CRAFTS . . . .
. . . . ENTERTAINMENT STAFF
OPENS DEC. 23
Easy To Reach by Bus, Train, or door-to-door Taxi Service
Write For Free Brochure
CHESTERS ZUNBARG
WOODBOURNE, N. Y. Tel. WOODBOURNE 1150

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perhaps call the CBS telecasts from the United Nations an illustration of the contradictions in the capitalist system. A little more than a year ago, when I discussed radio with *Pravda's* formidable David Zaslavsky, he assured me that broadcasting of truly peaceful purpose was possible only in the Soviet Union. It might interest Zaslavsky to know that the UN television deal was arranged in the best capitalist tradition—a long-distance telephone talk between CBS's $100,000-a-year president, Frank Stanton, and Henry Ford II. Some $360,000 changed hands during the conversation.

Through the facilities of ABC-TV, a "sponsor" was induced to spend about $40,000 for another good-will gesture of only one night's duration. In this instance, the triple play included Mark Woods, president of ABC; W. S. S. Rodgers, chairman of the Texas Company's board of directors; and George A. Sloan, chairman of the board of the Metropolitan Opera Company. As a result, viewers in six cities—New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, Detroit and Chicago—were able to see and hear the Met's opening night.

As at Lake Success, the lens work in the Metropolitan Opera House was too often unimaginative, sometimes downright annoying. But in both cases, producers and directors must be accounted blameless for many of the faults, since they are onlookers, not stage managers, of the events they try to picture. The opera is still thrilling entertainment, even when the camera fails to show more than two members of a trio on the Met's vast stage.

For opera staged for television, viewers must await the NBC-TV production of its series of four, to broadcast (in English!) Saturday nights, at 10 o'clock, once a month, beginning January 14. Dr. Peter Herman Adler, who did Act IV of "La Bohême" for NBC-TV last season, will be in charge, and I don't anticipate any of the bizarre guillotine effects that appeared in the showing of "Der Rosenkavalier" from the Met.

On the other hand, ABC did bring much of the Met's opening excitement to the screen. Backstage activities were explained by Edward Johnson; frontgate society snapshots were commented on by John Daly and Pauline Frederick; the libretto was explained by Milton Cross; and entr'acte interviews that weren't too banal were under the guidance of Deems Taylor. Eleanor Steber and Risë Stevens were the most welcome visitors I have had in my home for a long time, and television's use of FM gave me a new appreciation of Fritz Reiner as conductor.

Neither the Ford people on the CBS-UN program, nor Texaco for its underwriting of the opera telecast, get more than the briefest "institutional" mention. Such "sponsors" earn their credit lines, along with the production and artistic personnel involved.

NBC's venture beyond studio walls may be seen on that network's TV hookup Tuesday nights, at 11. The program is called "City at Midnight." For an hour or so (one night it was only 45 minutes), a play is staged on the streets, waterfront or jazz belt of New York. The drama, too often, has more intent than content, but there is excitement in plays thus staged on location. The cameras on this program are used with imagination to take advantage of their inherent flexibility and mobility. If the writing catches up with the photography, "City at Midnight" should become one of the best dramatic hours on television.

It is not easy to go wandering with a television camera and a price, in directorial neatness, must be paid for the freedom; but the rewards are great. Perhaps this season, which started poorly enough, will yet bring some advances of the imagination. Quite grown-up now on its scientific and technical sides, television's program and production departments should begin to act like adults. If Texaco and Ford can assist the process, they deserve whatever credit and profit they reap. Fortunately, there is no Hatch Act affecting a corporation's contribution to art. SAUL CARSON

Printed by STEINBERG PRESS, INC., Morgan & Johnson Aves., Brooklyn 6, N. Y. 178

BOOKS

"I am grateful to you for granting me some insight into this fascinating world."—*Thomas Mann*

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A YOGI

By

Paramhansa Yogananda

"Fascinating and clearly annotated study."—*Newsweek.* "A rare account."—*N. Y. Times.* "Refreshingly written."—*Tomorrow.* "Engrossing; a'litterarity'."—*Grandy Syndicated Reviews.*

$3.50—500 pp., 32 pages of unusual photos
SELF-REALIZATION FELLOWSHIP
Dept. R, 3880 San Rafael Ave., Los Angeles 65, Calif.

POETICA EROTICA: 770 Pages, rare, curious, amatory verse! Unusual volume! Unexpurgated! Send $3.75. Satisfaction guaranteed. NATIONAL BOOK SERVICE, 3423 Douglas, Chicago.

ATHEIST BOOKS. 32-page catalogue free. Truth Seeker Co., 38 Park Row, N. Y. C. 8.

CIGARETTES

CIGARETTES—Popular brands $1.51 per carton postpaid. West of Mississippi add 7¢ per carton. Min. order 3 cartons. Send check or money order. King Co., Elkton 2, Md.

DECORATIONS

Alive! **TREE**
Xmas **DECORATIONS**

FRESH! Picked, packed, shipped date you desire. *Huge* box 44" long x 15" x 12", filled with lovely holly, Xmas tree, rare Carolina long leaf pine sprays, native cedar and pine sprays, rare cone-covered pine sprays, all packed in moist moss for *fresh* delivery—*all for only $3.98 prepaid!* Decorate with real thing this Christmas and watch friends gasp. HURRY, quantity limited! Money back if not delighted! Rush only $3.98 *now* to GUY CAUSEY'S LITTLE FARM, Route 4, Greensboro 21, N. C.

FOR SALE

4-ROOM COTTAGE in Chalker Beach colony, Old Saybrook, Conn. $4,500. Leased to June. Buy now and collect this winter's rent. Snapshot and details from Mrs. S. O. Jackson, West Elm St., Deep River, Connecticut.

GEIGER COUNTER

MAKE your next vacation trip profitable as well as enjoyable. Take a GEIGER COUNTER along. You may yet win that $10,000.00 for locating Uranium ores. $54.50 postpaid. Great Lakes Plastic Chemical Co., Leaf River 1, Illinois.

HANDWRITING ANALYSIS

SCIENTIFIC HANDWRITING analysis. Alfred Kanfer, 62 Leroy St., N. Y. C. Tel. WA 4-1575. Cooperating with doctors; psychologists, schools, firms, industries. Lessons. By appointment, or mail. Marital, educational, vocational, psychological problems. Fee $3.00.

LANGUAGES

LINGUAPHONE MAKES LANGUAGES EASY. At home learn to speak Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, French, German, Russian, by quick, easy Linguaphone Conversational method. Save time work, money. Send for FREE book. Linguaphone Institute, 86 RCA Bldg., New York

PECANS

It's *pecan harvest time* in the heart of Texas. Ten pounds finest papershells prepaid for five dollars. (U. S. only.)
FABIS FARM BROWNWOOD, TEXAS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There are Harper Books for Everybody

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT'S
This I Remember

"Wonderful . . . sheer entertainment . . . It is as a human document that I have read and felt it, and thus it will be read and felt by generations of Americans." —VINCENT SHEEAN, *N. Y. Herald Tribune Book Review.* "Only a great woman could have written it." —ARTHUR SCHLESINGER, *Saturday Review.* 25 pages of family pictures. $4.50

DAVID E. LILIENTHAL'S
This I Do Believe

A book of affirmation and hope. "A master plan for everyday democracy."—*Washington Star.* "The kind of philosophy Mr. Lilienthal expounds may well be a more powerful weapon in our defense than the furious and expanding atom. And it has the advantage of not being a secret weapon."—R. L. DUFFUS, *N. Y. Times Book Review.* $2.50

CONGRESS ON TRIAL

The Politics of Modern Law-Making. By JAMES M. BURNS. "A first-rate contribution to the discussion of a problem of first-rate importance."—*N. Y. Times.* $3.00

WORLD FAITH

The Story of the Religions of the United Nations. By RUTH CRANSTON. "Contains the kind of stuff all of us should read and digest."—*N. Y. Times.* $3.00

JACK BELDEN'S
China Shakes the World

"One of the best books ever published about the Chinese . . . an explosion of history as exciting as a novel of suspense . . . Belden has re-created the lives of many dozens of unforgettable Chinese: a wandering beggar writer, a revengeful farm wife, a village landlord, a guerrilla assassin . . . a magnificent picture." —RICHARD E. LAUTERBACH, *Saturday Review.* $5.00

VIRGINIA COWLES'
No Cause for Alarm

"It seems to me to tell Americans just what they ought to know about England in a way that they can enjoy and understand."—WALTER DURANTY. "As rich as a fruit cake—as informative as the World Almanac. She is so impeccably right."—JOHN W. VANDERCOOK. $3.75

KENTUCKY ON THE MARCH

By HARRY W. SCHACTER. How Kentucky did something about its shortcomings. "One of the most excellent stories of democracy at work that I have seen."—ELEANOR ROOSEVELT. $3.00

DAY OF JUDGMENT

By DAVID CUSHMAN COYLE. A wise, mature approach to world problems. "Intelligent, urbane."—*The Nation.* $3.00

At all bookstores

HARPER & BROTHERS • 49 East 33rd St., N.Y. 16

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED